

Central Business District  
Architectural Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes

Date: March 3, 2015

Location: City Hall, 1300 Perdido Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, New Orleans, LA

Called to order: 9:30 a.m.

Adjourned: 11:30 a.m.

Members Present: Elliott Perkins, Lee Ledbetter, James Amdal

Members arriving after beginning of the meeting: Robbie Cangelosi

Members absent: Ashley King

---

**I. AGENDA**

1. 103-111 Tchoupitoulas, 400-422 Canal St:

Application: The proposed scope of work includes re-subdividing of 10 lots into one major lot of record and the proposed development of a 21 story hotel building with 168 internal parking spaces; includes demolition of 422 Canal Street.

Motion: The ARC agreed that the visual break between the proposed new construction and the historic buildings is a positive design element. The scale of the podium and second floor galleries are also successful. However, it is inappropriate to only retain the facades of the existing historic buildings. The thinness of material at the skin of the proposed facades, although appearing to peel away at the corner to expose a remnant of the original building, is not respectful of the historic architecture. If new construction is to rise behind the existing buildings, this should happen at a depth of at least 20-30 feet from the front facades. This includes the building at 422 Canal Street. In order for this proposed tower to be successful, a significant portion of the original buildings should remain while the new construction “grows” out of it. The proposed new construction appears to be a contemporary tower that is merely decorated with a pastiche of historic building material at its base.

The other high rise towers of this district rise with their slender facades facing Canal Street. The weight of mass of this proposal inappropriately walls off the majority of the entire block, radically departing from the developmental trends of the Canal Street district. This would set a bad precedent. The ARC understands the developer’s programmatic requirements. However, this site does not support this program. The seventy foot height limitation of the current CZO is what is appropriate for this site. Although the rhythm of the breaks in massing and facets of the proposed tower speak to the architectural patterns along Canal Street, the random rhythm and placement of windows works against it.

Elliott Perkins made a motion to recommend denial of the design as proposed. The ARC requested that the design be revised as per the ARC comments

By: Elliott Perkins

Seconded: Lee Ledbetter

Result: Passed

In favor: James Amdal, Lee Ledbetter, Elliott Perkins.

Opposed:

Comments:

2. 632 Tchoupitoulas Street

Application: Demolition of existing building remnant and construction of a new 7-story, 108,831 sf hotel with full service restaurant on existing vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC was concerned that the revised Commerce Street elevation provides no clear differentiation between vehicular and pedestrian entry. The canopy should be eliminated above the vehicle entry bays and only provided at an intermediate bay to emphasize pedestrian entry at that location. The ARC also recommended further articulation of the cornice by beefing up the masonry corbelling.

Lee Ledbetter made a motion to recommend conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level.

By: Lee Ledbetter

Seconded: James Amdal

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, James Amdal, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

At this time, Robbie Cangelosi arrived.

3. 602-10 S. Peters Street

Application: Construct 4000 sf penthouse, and extension of adjacent existing covered gallery on Fulton Street facade.

Motion: The ARC agreed the alternate massing proposals do not visually recede as successfully as the flat roofed proposal. However, the ARC agreed that the stepping at the roofline inappropriately references a cornice and the height of the roof edge should be consistently 12'-0" and the header heights of the openings should be increased as necessary. The ARC agreed the revisions to the gallery adequately respond to their previous recommendations.

Elliott Perkins made a motion to recommend the Commission grant conceptual approval of the proposal with the recommendations of the ARC and the details to be worked out at the Staff level.

Seconded: James Amdal

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Robby Cangelosi, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

4. 1037 Magazine Street

Application: Enclosure of existing outdoor deck with glazed curtain wall system with sliding glass panels.

Motion: The ARC agreed the proposed NanaWall is critical to the design, but question whether the existing green wall would still be viable if the enclosure is built. The ARC recommended this wall maintain its translucency, and suggested that a decorative glass wall could be successful in this location. The ARC also suggested considering how the enclosure will affect the lighting of the existing ramp. The ARC agreed the proposed blade sign is appropriate, but is also excessive in addition to the existing monument sign.

Elliott Perkins made a motion to recommend the Commission grant conceptual approval of the proposal with the recommendations of the ARC and the details to be worked out at the Staff level on the condition the NanaWall remains a part of the design as proposed and there is additional review of the proposed signage.

Seconded: Lee Ledbetter

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Robby Cangelosi, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

At this time, James Amdal left the meeting.

5. 1101-1107 S Peters Street

Application: Install canopy

Motion:

The ARC agreed it is acceptable to intersect the windows immediately above and suggested that it occur above the bottom row of lights of the lower sash or at the meeting rail of the sashes. One ARC member suggested angling the canopy upward away from the building so it can be mounted at the transom bar above the door, although whether this solution allows for the required clearance over the sidewalk needs to be confirmed. The ARC agreed eliminating the decorative brass elements and the curve of the 1990 proposal is appropriate, but recommended maintaining the glass deck to prevent darkening the entry. One ARC member suggested that the canopy only cover the door that is operable to more clearly denote the entry.

Elliott Perkins made a motion to defer further review of the project pending further development.

Seconded: Lee Ledbetter

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Robby Cangelosi, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

7. 864-870 S Peters St

Application: Supplemental permit to revise exterior cladding from corten steel to brick at the new four-story building.

Motion:

The ARC agreed the concept of using maganese brick is appropriate; however, the design and pattern of the elevations needs further study with regards to the material definition of brick. The ARC agreed the woven brick pattern at the two parking levels does not successfully relate to the design of the brick above and below, and the elevations need to read as a more cohesive whole. The ARC agreed the seeming randomness of the previous corten steel design, which is referenced in the 4th and 5th floors, is lost in the regularized pattern of the woven brick between pilasters at the 2nd and 3rd floors. Furthermore, the woven brick is reading as more of a solid mass than the other floors, which have a higher proportion of glass and/or metal screening; the uninterrupted brick on the Julia Street elevation is also reading as a heavier, more solid mass than the previously approved steel and needs further study. The ARC suggested angling or otherwise adjusting the brick slightly to blur the sharp edges.

Elliott Perkins made a motion to defer further review of the project pending incorporation of the ARC recommendations.

Second: Lee Ledbetter

Result: Passed

In Favor: Elliott Perkins, Robby Cangelosi, Lee Ledbetter

Opposed:

Comments:

8. 738 Canal St

Application: Removal of an existing storefront and infill of wall to match existing conditions.

Motion: The ARC recommended removal of the existing storefront elements along Royal Street and constructing a masonry infill with simple scoring details to match existing on the remainder of the building elevation.

Elliott Perkins made a motion for conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the Staff level.

Second: Lee Ledbetter

Result: Passed

In Favor: Elliott Perkins, Robby Cangelosi, Lee Ledbetter,

Opposed:

Comments:

At this time, there being no further business to attend to, the meeting was adjourned.